arXiv:0908.2652v2 [cond-mat.str-el] 15 Nov 2009

Emptiness and Depletion Formation Probability in spin models with inverse square interaction

Fabio Franchini[a], Manas Kulkarni[b,c]

[a] *The Abdus Salam ICTP; Strada Costiera 11, Trieste, 34100, Italy*
[b] *Department of Physics and Astronomy, Stony Brook University, Stony Brook, NY 11794-3800*
[c] *Department of Condensed Matter Physics and Materials Science, Brookhaven National Laboratory, Upton, NY-11973*

Abstract

We calculate the Emptiness Formation Probability (EFP) in the spin-Calogero Model (sCM) and Haldane-Shastry Model (HSM) using their hydrodynamic description. The EFP is the probability that a region of space is completely void of particles in the ground state of a quantum many body system. We calculate this probability in an instanton approach, by considering the more general problem of an arbitrary depletion of particles (DFP). In the limit of large size of depletion region the probability is dominated by a classical configuration in imaginary time that satisfies a set of boundary conditions and the action calculated on such solution gives the EFP/DFP with exponential accuracy. We show that the calculation for sCM can be elegantly performed by representing the gradientless hydrodynamics of spin particles as a sum of two spin-less Calogero collective field theories in auxiliary variables. Interestingly, the result we find for the EFP can be casted in a form reminiscing of spin-charge separation, which should be violated for a non-linear effect such as this. We also highlight the connections between sCM, HSM and $\lambda = 2$ spin-less Calogero model from a EFP/DFP perspective.

Key words: EFP, DFP, Integrable Models, Calogero-Sutherland, Haldane-Shastry, Hydrodynamics, Collective Field Theory
PACS: 71.10.Pm, 75.10.Pq, 02.30.Ik, 03.75.Kk, 71.27.+a

Contents

1 Introduction **2**

2 Two-fluid description **5**

Email addresses: fabio@ictp.it (Fabio Franchini), kulkarni@grad.physics.sunysb.edu (Manas Kulkarni)

3 The instantonic action **7**

4 Depletion Formation Probability **8**
4.1 Asymptotic singlet state 10

5 Emptiness Formation Probability **10**
5.1 Free fermions with spin 10
5.2 Spin-less Calogero-Sutherland model 11
5.3 Probability of Formation of Ferromagnetic Strings 11
5.4 The freezing limit 12
5.5 Haldane-Shastry model 12

6 Spin Depletion Probability **13**

7 Charge Depletion Probability **15**

8 Discussion of the results **16**

9 Conclusions **17**

A Action for the DFP solution **19**

B Linearized Hydrodynamics and DFP **22**

1. Introduction

One-dimensional integrable models have an important role in the study of strongly correlated systems. When the reduced dimensionality makes interaction unavoidable, perturbative techniques can quickly loose applicability and over the years more sophisticated tools have been developed to tackle these problems. These tools clearly involve certain approximations and the existence of an exact solution for some models can allow to check their validity.

The conventional approach in solving quantum integrable model is known as Bethe Ansatz (and its generalization). It is very successful in constructing the thermodynamics of a system, but not very suitable to study its dynamics and the correlation functions, due to the increasing complexity of its solutions. However, a very elegant formalism was developed using the Quantum Inverse Scattering Method (QISM) [1] to express correlation functions as determinants of certain integral operators (Fredholm determinants). In this formalism, the simplest correlation function one can write is known as the *Emptiness Formation Probability* (EFP) and measures the probability $P(R)$ that a region of length $2R$ is completely void of particles. For lattice models, one is interested in $P(n)$, the probability that n consecutive lattice sites are empty. In spin chain, taking advantage of the Jordan-Wigner mapping between particles and spins, the same quantity can be thought of as the *Probability of Formation of Ferromagnetic Strings* (PFFS), i.e. the probability that n consecutive spins are aligned in the same direction.

One should notice that the EFP is an n-point correlator and is, therefore, a much more complicated object compared to the usual two-point correlation functions one normally studies in condensed matter physics. However, due to the strongly interacting nature of the 1-D model, the QISM tells us that it is in fact no worse than other correlators between two points a length n apart and even somewhat simpler and more natural. Moreover, the EFP is one of those extended objects like the Von Neumann Entropy, or the Renyi Entropy, that in recent years have attracted a lot of interest because of their ability to capture global properties that were not observed before from the study of 2-point correlation functions. The latter quantities are of course motivated by studies of entanglement and quantum computation, while the EFP arises naturally in the contest of integrable theories.

Despite the claimed simplicity, the calculation of the EFP is by no means an easy task. For some models, the specific structure of the solution has allowed to find the asymptotic behavior of the EFP as $n \to \infty$. For instance, the EFP in the whole of the phase-diagram of the XY model was calculated in [2, 3, 4, 5] using the theory of Toeplitz determinants, while for the critical phase of the XXZ spin chain the solution was found in [6, 7, 8] using a multiple-integral representation. The EFP has been considered also for the 6-vertex model [9, 10, 11], for higher spins XXZ [12] and for dimer models [13]. We also remark that high temperature expansions of the EFP for Heisenberg chains have been studied in [14, 15, 16]. A recent review of the EFP can be found in [5] or [17].

Field theory approaches are normally most suited for the calculation of large distance asymptotics of correlation functions, but conventional techniques like those inspired by the Luttinger Liquid paradigm (i.e. bosonization) are not appropriate for extended objects like the EFP and only capture its qualitative behavior, while being quantitatively unreliable, as it was showed in [18]. The reason for this failure is that Luttinger Liquid is applicable only to low-energy excitations around the Fermi points, where the linear spectrum approximation is valid, while correlators like the EFP involve degrees of freedom very deep in the Fermi sea, where the whole spectrum with its curvature is important.

For this reason, the field theory calculation of the EFP requires a non-linear generalization of conventional bosonization, i.e. a true hydrodynamic description of the system. In [17] it was shown that, with such a non-linear collective description available, the calculation of the EFP is possible by employing, for instance, an instanton approach.

In this paper, we will extend the machinery developed in [17] and apply it to the spin-Calogero Model (sCM), for which a (gradientless) hydrodynamic description was recently constructed from its Bethe Ansatz solution [19]. The sCM is the spin$-1/2$ generalization [20, 21, 22] of the well-known Calogero-Sutherland model [23] and is defined by the Hamiltonian

$$H = -\frac{\hbar^2}{2}\sum_{j=1}^{N}\frac{\partial^2}{\partial x_j^2} + \frac{\hbar^2}{2}\left(\frac{\pi}{L}\right)^2\sum_{j\neq l}\frac{\lambda(\lambda-\mathbf{P}_{jl})}{\sin^2\frac{\pi}{L}(x_j-x_l)}\,, \tag{1}$$

where $\mathbf{P}_{jl}$ is the operator that exchanges the positions of particles j and l. We

chose to analyze this Hamiltonian assuming it acts on fermionic particles, which means that the exchange term selects an anti-ferromagnetic ground state [19]. The coupling parameter λ is taken to be positive and N is the total number of particles.

In [19], a collective description of the model was derived using four hydrodynamic fields: the density of particle with spin up/down $\rho_{\uparrow,\downarrow}$ and their velocities $v_{\uparrow,\downarrow}$. The Hamiltonian in terms of these fields is valid only for slowly evolving configurations, where terms with derivatives of the density fields can be neglected. This description is referred to as a *gradientless hydrodynamics*. In [19], this theory was used to show the non-linear coupling between the spin and charge degrees of freedom beyond the Luttinger Liquid paradigm and it was shown that, while a charge excitation can evolve without affecting the spin sector (for instance for a spin singlet configuration), a spin excitation carries also some charge with it, in a non-trivial way.

The EFP for the sCM has not been considered in the literature yet. For the spin-less case of the Calogero-Sutherland interaction, the asymptotic behavior of the EFP was obtained using the form of the ground state wavefunction and thermodynamical arguments [24] (see [5, 17] for details). It should be noted that for certain special values of the coupling parameter λ, the spin-less theory is tightly linked with Random Matrix Theory (RMT) and the EFP is the probability of having no energy eigenvalues in a given interval. For these values of λ the EFP can be calculated with much greater accuracy due to the additional structure provided by RMT [26].

If we write the ground state of the system as $\Psi_G(x_1, x_2, \ldots, x_N)$, the Emptiness Formation Probability is defined as

$$P(R) \equiv \frac{1}{\langle \Psi_G | \Psi_G \rangle} \int_{|x_j|>R} \mathrm{d}x_1 \ldots \mathrm{d}x_N \, |\Psi_G(x_1, \ldots, x_N)|^2 \ , \tag{2}$$

or, following [1]

$$P(R) = \lim_{\alpha \to \infty} \langle \Psi_G | \mathrm{e}^{-\alpha \int_{-R}^{R} \rho_c(x) \mathrm{d}x} | \Psi_G \rangle \ , \tag{3}$$

where $\rho_c(x)$ is the total particle density operator

$$\rho_c(x) \equiv \sum_{j=1}^{N} \delta(x - x_j) \ . \tag{4}$$

For a model like the sCM, we can also introduce the EFPs for particles with spin up or down separately

$$P_{\uparrow,\downarrow}(R) = \lim_{\alpha \to \infty} \langle \Psi_G | \mathrm{e}^{-\alpha \int_{-R}^{R} \rho_{\uparrow,\downarrow}(x) \mathrm{d}x} | \Psi_G \rangle \ , \tag{5}$$

which will allow us to discuss the EFP as well as the PFFS.

The approach we use to calculate the EFPs (5) in this work is similar to what was explained in [17]. The idea is to consider the system as a quantum fluid

evolving in imaginary time (Euclidean space). Then the EFP can be considered as the probability of a rare fluctuation that will deplete the region $-R < x < R$ of particle at a given imaginary time (say $\tau = 0$). With exponential accuracy, the leading contribution to this probability comes from the action calculated on the saddle point solution (instanton) satisfying the EFP boundary condition.

In section 2 we will first review the results of [19] and transform them into an intriguing form where the dynamics can be decoupled into two independent fluids of spin-less Calogero-Sutherland particles. This two-fluid description is one of the interesting observations of this paper. In section 3 we will explain the instanton approach and formulate the problem in this language. In section 4 we will concentrate on a generalization of the EFP, the Depletion Formation Probability (DFP) which was introduced in [18]. This correlator will allow us to calculate the different EFPs very efficiently by taking its different limits in section 5. Most noticeably, we will derive the PFFS for the Haldane-Shastry model as the freezing limit of the sCM. In section 6 and 7 we will consider two additional DFP problems. Instead of specifying boundary conditions for both the spin and charge sectors of the fluid as we did in the previous sections, we will now relax these conditions and constrain only one component at a time: this analysis suggests that an effective spin-charge separation can be conjectured for the EFP/DFP of the sCM. In section 8 we combine all these results and suggest a physical interpretation of them. The final section contains some concluding remarks. To avoid interruptions in the exposition, certain technical formalities are moved to the appendices and are organized as follows. In appendix A we will revise and adapt the calculation of [17] to calculate the instanton action for our cases. In appendix B we will repeat this calculation in the linearized hydrodynamics approximation or bosonization, to aid the discussions in section 8.

2. Two-fluid description

In [19] the gradientless hydrodynamic description for the sCM (1) was derived in terms of densities and velocities of spin up and down particles: $\rho_{\uparrow,\downarrow}(t,x)$, $v_{\uparrow,\downarrow}(t,x)$. Here, we prefer to use densities and velocities of the *majority* and *minority* spin: $\rho_{1,2}(t,x), v_{1,2}(t,x)$, i.e. the subscript 1 (2) takes the value $\uparrow$ or $\downarrow$ which ever is most (least) abundant species:

$$\rho_1 \equiv \frac{\rho_\uparrow + \rho_\downarrow + |\rho_\uparrow - \rho_\downarrow|}{2} = \frac{\rho_c + \rho_s}{2} , \tag{6}$$

$$\rho_2 \equiv \frac{\rho_\uparrow + \rho_\downarrow - |\rho_\uparrow - \rho_\downarrow|}{2} = \frac{\rho_c - \rho_s}{2} , \tag{7}$$

where we introduced the charge and spin density

$$\rho_c(t,x) = \rho_\uparrow + \rho_\downarrow = \rho_1 + \rho_2 , \tag{8}$$

$$\rho_s(t,x) = |\rho_\uparrow - \rho_\downarrow| = \rho_1 - \rho_2 . \tag{9}$$

Please note that whatever species is majority or minority is decided dynamically in each point in space and time.

Under the condition [19]

$$|v_1 - v_2| < \pi\rho_s \ , \tag{10}$$

the Hamiltonian is

$$H = \frac{1}{12\pi\left(\lambda+1\right)} \int_{-\infty}^{+\infty} \mathrm{d}x \left\{ k_{R1}^3 - k_{L1}^3 + \frac{1}{2\lambda+1}\left(k_{R2}^3 - k_{L2}^3\right) \right\} \ , \tag{11}$$

where

$$\begin{aligned} k_{R1,L1} &\equiv v_1 \pm (\lambda+1)\pi\rho_1 \pm \lambda\pi\rho_2 \ , \\ k_{R2,L2} &= (\lambda+1)v_2 - \lambda v_1 \pm (2\lambda+1)\pi\rho_2 \end{aligned} \tag{12}$$

are the four *dressed Fermi momenta*.

It turns out that an auxiliary set of hydrodynamic variables decouples the Hamiltonian (11) into the sum of two independent spin-less Calogero-Sutherland fluids a and b:

$$H = H_a + H_b = \sum_{\alpha=a,b} \int \mathrm{d}x \left[\frac{1}{2}\rho_\alpha v_\alpha^2 + \frac{\pi^2\lambda_\alpha^2}{6}\rho_\alpha^3 \right] \ , \tag{13}$$

where

$$\rho_a \equiv \frac{k_{R1} - k_{L1}}{2\pi\lambda_a} = \rho_1 + \frac{\lambda}{\lambda+1}\rho_2 \ , \tag{14}$$

$$\rho_b \equiv \frac{k_{R2} - k_{L2}}{2\pi\lambda_b} = \frac{1}{\lambda+1}\rho_2 \ , \tag{15}$$

$$v_a \equiv \frac{k_{R1} + k_{L1}}{2} = v_1 \ , \tag{16}$$

$$v_b \equiv \frac{k_{R2} + k_{L2}}{2} = (\lambda+1)\, v_2 - \lambda v_1 \ , \tag{17}$$

$$\lambda_a \equiv \lambda + 1 \ , \tag{18}$$

$$\lambda_b \equiv (\lambda+1)\,(2\lambda+1) \ . \tag{19}$$

We remark that both the auxiliary variables and the real variables satisfy the canonical commutation relations, i.e.

$$[\rho_\alpha(x), v_\beta(y)] = -\mathrm{i}\hbar\delta_{\alpha,\beta}\delta'(x-y) \ , \qquad \alpha,\beta = \{1,2\};\{a,b\} \ . \tag{20}$$

The form of the Hamiltonian (13) is one of the interesting observation of this paper, since it allows us to reduce the spin Calogero-Sutherland model into a sum of two spin-less theories. Each of the terms in square brackets in (13) is the gradientless Hamiltonian of a spin-less CS system with coupling constants $\lambda_{a,b}$ given by (18, 19). In [17] the gradientless hydrodynamics of spin-less particles, like the ones in (13) was used to calculate the EFP from the asymptotics of an instanton solution. In the next section we review this approach and we leave the mathematical details to appendix A.

3. The instantonic action

Let us perform a Wick's rotation to work in imaginary time $\tau \equiv \mathrm{i}t$. Note that this makes the velocities in (12) imaginary ($v \to \mathrm{i}v$) and the k's complex numbers. The $x-t$ plane is mapped into the complex plane spanned by $z \equiv x + \mathrm{i}\tau$.

Following [17], we will calculate the EFP as an instanton configuration (i.e. a classical solution in Euclidean space) that satisfies the boundary condition

$$\rho_\alpha(\tau = 0; -R < x < R) = 0 \; , \qquad \alpha = 1, 2, c \; , \tag{21}$$

in the limit $R \to \infty$, i.e. R much bigger than any other length scale in the system. This limit guarantees that the gradient-less hydrodynamics (13) is valid in the bulk of the space-time. Once we have the classical solution of the equation of motion ϕ_{EFP} that satisfies (21), a saddle-point calculation gives the EFP with exponential accuracy as the action $\mathcal{S}$ calculated on this optimal configuration [17]:

$$P(R) \simeq \mathrm{e}^{-\mathcal{S}[\phi_{\mathrm{EFP}}]} \; . \tag{22}$$

Of course, to uniquely specify the problem, the boundary conditions at infinity have to be provided as well and we will take them to be those of an equilibrium configuration:

$$\begin{aligned} &\rho_1(\tau, x) \overset{x,\tau\to\infty}{\to} \rho_{01} \; , \qquad && v_1(\tau, x) \overset{x,\tau\to\infty}{\to} 0 \; , \\ &\rho_2(\tau, x) \overset{x,\tau\to\infty}{\to} \rho_{02} \; , \qquad && v_2(\tau, x) \overset{x,\tau\to\infty}{\to} 0 \; . \end{aligned} \tag{23}$$

When $\rho_{01} = \rho_{02}$ we have an asymptotic singlet state (the AFM in zero magnetic field). The condition $\rho_{01} \neq \rho_{02}$ can be achieved via a constant external magnetic field which would result in a finite equilibrium magnetization. It is easy to implement these boundary conditions in our two-fluid description using (14-17).

The key point for the calculation is that we can represent the hydrodynamic fields in terms of the dressed Fermi momenta k_{R1}, k_{R2} (which in Euclidean space become complex and complex conjugated to k_{L1}, k_{L2} respectively) through (12):

$$k_{R1} = \lambda_a \pi \rho_a + \mathrm{i}v_a \; , \qquad k_{R2} = \lambda_b \pi \rho_b + \mathrm{i}v_b \; . \tag{24}$$

In [19], it was shown that these k-fields propagate independently according to 4 decoupled Riemann-Hopf equations

$$\partial_\tau w - \mathrm{i}w\partial_x w = 0 \; , \qquad w = k_{R,L;1,2} \; . \tag{25}$$

These equations have the general (implicit) solution

$$w = F(x + \mathrm{i}w\tau) \tag{26}$$

where $F(z)$ is an analytic function to be chosen to satisfy the boundary conditions.

Guided by [17], the solution for an EFP problem is

$$k_{R1} = F_a(x + \mathrm{i}k_{R1}\tau) \,, \qquad\qquad k_{R2} = F_b(x + \mathrm{i}k_{R2}\tau) \,, \tag{27}$$

with

$$F_a(z) \equiv \lambda_a \pi \rho_{0a} + \lambda_a \pi \eta_a \left(\frac{z}{\sqrt{z^2 - R^2}} - 1 \right) \,, \tag{28}$$

$$F_b(z) \equiv \lambda_b \pi \rho_{0b} + \lambda_b \pi \eta_b \left(\frac{z}{\sqrt{z^2 - R^2}} - 1 \right) \,, \tag{29}$$

which automatically satisfy the conditions at infinity (23):

$$\begin{aligned} \rho_a(\tau, x \to \infty) &\to \rho_{01} + \frac{\lambda}{\lambda + 1} \rho_{02} \equiv \rho_{0a} \,, \\ \rho_b(\tau, x \to \infty) &\to \frac{1}{\lambda + 1} \rho_{02} \,, \equiv \rho_{0b} \,, \\ v_{a,b}(\tau, x \to \infty) &\to 0 \,, \end{aligned} \tag{30}$$

while $\eta_{a,b}$ are two, possibly complex, constants that allow to satisfy the EFP boundary conditions (21).

In appendix A we show that the instanton action can be expressed as a contour integral where only the behaviors of the solutions (27) at infinity and close to the depletion region are needed, saving us the complication of solving the implicit equations in generality. Using the two-fluid description, the action can be written as the sum of two spin-less Calogero-Sutherland fluids: from (96) we have

$$\mathcal{S}_{\mathrm{EFP}} = \frac{1}{2} \pi^2 R^2 \sum_{\alpha = a,b} \lambda_\alpha \, \eta_\alpha \, \bar{\eta}_\alpha \,. \tag{31}$$

Before we proceed further, we should mention that the two-fluid description we employ is valid as long as the inequality (10) is satisfied. In fact, the solution (27) could violate the inequality in a small region around the points $(\tau, x) = (0, \pm R)$. However, close to these points the hydrodynamic description is expected to be somewhat pathological, because gradient corrections (which we neglect) become important. As it was argued in [18, 17], the contributions that would come to the EFP from these small regions are subleading and negligible, in the asymptotic limit $R \to \infty$ we consider. Therefore, we do not need to worry about what happens near the points $(\tau, x) = (0, \pm R)$. However, a consequence of the "singular" nature of these points is that, in our solution, the species that constitutes the majority (minority) spin in the region of depletion $-R < x < R$ at $\tau = 0$, could switch and become minority (majority) at infinity. This could be important to keep in mind in interpreting our formulae, but our formalism already takes that into account naturally.

4. Depletion Formation Probability

It is more convenient to consider a generalization of the EFP problem, called Depletion Formation Probability (DFP) which was introduced in [18]. In hydro-

dynamic language the DFP boundary conditions for the *majority* and *minority* spins are

$$\begin{aligned} \rho_1(\tau=0;-R<x<R) &= \tilde{\rho}_1 \ , \\ \rho_2(\tau=0;-R<x<R) &= \tilde{\rho}_2 \ . \end{aligned} \tag{32}$$

The DFP is a natural generalization of the EFP (21) and it reduces to it for $\tilde{\rho}_{1,2}=0$. Of course, there is some ambiguity on the microscopic definition of the DFP (see [18, 17]). One can, for instance, consider it as the macroscopic version of the s-EFP introduced in [25]. We will first calculate the DFP as the most general case and later take the appropriate interesting limits.

In terms of the auxiliary fields we introduced in (14-17) to achieve the two-fluids description (13), the DFP boundary conditions are

$$\begin{aligned} \rho_a(\tau=0,-R<x<R) &= \tilde{\rho}_1+\frac{\lambda}{\lambda+1}\tilde{\rho}_2\equiv\tilde{\rho}_a \ , \\ \rho_b(\tau=0,-R<x<R) &= \frac{1}{\lambda+1}\tilde{\rho}_2\equiv\tilde{\rho}_b \ . \end{aligned} \tag{33}$$

We specify the parameters $\eta_{1,2}$ in (28,29) by expressing the boundary conditions (33) in terms of the dressed momenta using

$$\begin{aligned} \rho_1 &= \frac{1}{\pi(\lambda+1)}\left[\mathrm{Re}\ k_{R1}-\frac{\lambda}{2\lambda+1}\,\mathrm{Re}\ k_{R2}\right] \ , \\ \rho_2 &= \frac{1}{\pi(2\lambda+1)}\,\mathrm{Re}\ k_{R2} \ , \\ v_1 &= \mathrm{Im}\ k_{R1} \ , \\ v_2 &= \frac{1}{\lambda+1}\Big[\mathrm{Im}\ k_{R2}+\lambda\,\mathrm{Im}\ k_{R1}\Big] \ . \end{aligned} \tag{34}$$

This leads to

$$\begin{aligned} \lambda_a\eta_a &= \lambda_a\left(\rho_{0a}-\tilde{\rho}_a\right) \\ &= (\lambda+1)(\rho_{01}-\tilde{\rho}_1)+\lambda(\rho_{02}-\tilde{\rho}_2) \ , \\ \lambda_b\eta_b &= \lambda_b\left(\rho_{0b}-\tilde{\rho}_b\right) \\ &= (2\lambda+1)\left(\rho_{02}-\tilde{\rho}_2\right) \ . \end{aligned} \tag{35}$$

It is now straightforward to obtain the DFP by substituting (35) into (31). After some simple algebra we get

$$\begin{aligned} P_{DFP}(R) &= \exp\left\{-\frac{\pi^2}{2}\left[\lambda\left(\rho_{0c}-\tilde{\rho}_c\right)^2+\left(\rho_{01}-\tilde{\rho}_1\right)^2+\left(\rho_{02}-\tilde{\rho}_2\right)^2\right]R^2\right\} \\ &= \exp\left\{-\frac{\pi^2}{2}\left[\left(\lambda+\frac{1}{2}\right)\left(\rho_{0c}-\tilde{\rho}_c\right)^2+\frac{1}{2}\left(\rho_{0s}-\tilde{\rho}_s\right)^2\right]R^2\right\} \ , \end{aligned} \tag{36}$$

where we introduced a notation in terms of the charge field ($\rho_{0c}=\rho_{01}+\rho_{02}$, $\tilde{\rho}_c=\tilde{\rho}_1+\tilde{\rho}_2$) and of the spin field ($\rho_{0s}=\rho_{01}-\rho_{02}$, $\tilde{\rho}_s=\tilde{\rho}_1-\tilde{\rho}_2$). Equation (36) is the main result of this work. To understand it better, we will consider several interesting limits.

4.1. Asymptotic singlet state

If no external magnetic field is applied, the equilibrium configuration of an anti-ferromagnetic system like the one we consider is in a singlet state. This means that in the boundary conditions at infinity (23) we should set $\rho_{01} = \rho_{02} = \rho_0$. In this limit (36) reduces to

$$\begin{aligned} P_{DFP}^{\text{singlet}}(R) &= \exp\left\{-\frac{\pi^2}{2}\left[\lambda\left(2\rho_0-\tilde{\rho}_c\right)^2+\left(\rho_0-\tilde{\rho}_1\right)^2+\left(\rho_0-\tilde{\rho}_2\right)^2\right]R^2\right\} \\ &= \exp\left\{-\frac{\pi^2}{2}\left[(\lambda+\frac{1}{2})\left(2\rho_0-\tilde{\rho}_c\right)^2+\frac{1}{2}\tilde{\rho}_s^2\right]R^2\right\}. \end{aligned} \tag{37}$$

5. Emptiness Formation Probability

By taking the limit $\tilde{\rho}_{1,2} = 0$ we can use (36) to calculate the different EFPs. The probability to find the region $-R < x < R$ at $\tau = 0$ completely empty of particles is therefore

$$\begin{aligned} P_{EFP}(R) &= \exp\left\{-\frac{\pi^2}{2}\left[\lambda\left(\rho_{01}+\rho_{02}\right)^2+\rho_{01}^2+\rho_{02}^2\right]R^2\right\} \\ &= \exp\left\{-\frac{\pi^2}{2}\left[(\lambda+\frac{1}{2})\rho_{0c}^2+\frac{1}{2}\rho_{0s}^2\right]R^2\right\}, \end{aligned} \tag{38}$$

which becomes

$$P_{EFP}^{\text{singlet}}(R) = \exp\left\{-\frac{\pi^2}{2}(\lambda+\frac{1}{2})(2\rho_0)^2R^2\right\} \tag{39}$$

for the asymptotic singlet state. This is equivalent to the EFP of a spin-less Calogero-Sutherland system with coupling constant $\lambda' = \lambda + 1/2$, see (43). This is consistent with the phase-space picture provided in [19], in which it is explained that for a singlet state each particle occupies an area of $\pi(\lambda + 1/2)$ due to the exclusion statistics, while it would occupy an area $\pi(\lambda+1)$ if it were alone. Therefore, in this context, the charge field can be thought of as describing a spin-less Calogero system with coupling constant $\lambda' = \lambda + 1/2$.

5.1. Free fermions with spin

Setting the coupling parameter $\lambda = 0$ corresponds to non-interacting (free) fermions with spins and this reduces (36) to

$$\begin{aligned} P_{DFP}^{\text{free fermions}}(R) &= \exp\left\{-\frac{1}{4}\left[\pi\left(\rho_{0c}-\tilde{\rho}_c\right)R\right]^2-\frac{1}{4}\left[\pi\left(\rho_{0s}-\tilde{\rho}_s\right)R\right]^2\right\} \\ &= \exp\left\{-\frac{1}{2}\left[\pi\left(\rho_{01}-\tilde{\rho}_1\right)R\right]^2-\frac{1}{2}\left[\pi\left(\rho_{02}-\tilde{\rho}_2\right)R\right]^2\right\}. \end{aligned} \tag{40}$$

This result is the same as the one obtained in [17]. The EFP is then

$$P_{EFP}^{\text{free fermions}}(R) = \exp\left\{ -\frac{1}{2}\left(\pi\rho_{01}R\right)^2 - \frac{1}{2}\left(\pi\rho_{02}R\right)^2 \right\}, \tag{41}$$

which agrees with the results obtained in the context of Random Matrix Theory [26, 24], where the subleading corrections were also found.

5.2. Spin-less Calogero-Sutherland model

Of course, the prime check to our formula for the DFP/EFP of the sCM is to take its spin-less limit $\tilde{\rho}_2 = \rho_{02} = 0$, which gives

$$P_{DFP}^{\text{spin-less}}(R) = \exp\left\{ -\frac{(\lambda+1)}{2}\pi^2\left(\rho_{01}-\tilde{\rho}_1\right)^2 R^2 \right\}, \tag{42}$$

$$P_{EFP}^{\text{spin-less}}(R) = \exp\left\{ -\frac{(\lambda+1)}{2}\pi^2\rho_{01}^2 R^2 \right\}, \tag{43}$$

in perfect agreement with [17, 24] for a spin-less Calogero-Sutherland system with coupling $\lambda' = \lambda + 1$.

5.3. Probability of Formation of Ferromagnetic Strings

If we require the minority spin particles to completely empty the region $-R < x < R$ at $\tau = 0$, we are left only with the majority spin and we created a (partially) polarized state. We can refer to this case as the Probability of Formation of Partially Ferromagnetic Strings (PFPFS) [18, 17]. Setting $\tilde{\rho}_2 = 0$ in (36) and leaving $\tilde{\rho}_1$ finite we have

$$P_{PFPFS}(R) = \exp\left\{ -\frac{\pi^2}{2}\left[\lambda\left(\rho_{01}-\tilde{\rho}_1+\rho_{02}\right)^2 + \left(\rho_{01}-\tilde{\rho}_1\right)^2 + \rho_{02}^2\right] R^2 \right\}. \tag{44}$$

The above is the probability of formation of ferromagnetic strings accompanied by a partial depletion of particles, since in the region of depletion we have $\tilde{\rho}_c = \tilde{\rho}_1$. We can impose that the average density of particles is constant everywhere by setting $\tilde{\rho}_1 = \rho_{01} + \rho_{02} = \rho_{0c}$, while still requiring all particles in the region $-R < x < R$ at $\tau = 0$ to be completely polarized (maximal magnetization: PFFS)

$$P_{PFFS}(R) = \exp\left\{ -\left[\pi\rho_{02}R\right]^2 \right\}. \tag{45}$$

Note that (45) is independent of λ and exactly corresponds to the Emptiness Formation Probability of a $\lambda' = \lambda + 1 = 2$ spin-less Calogero model with background density given by ρ_{02} (43). Interestingly the same result (52) will be derived in the next sections as the EFP of minority spins, i.e. $\tilde{\rho}_2 = 0$, in the Haldane-Shastry model (46). This is just another aspect of the well-known relation between spin-Calogero, Haldane-Shastry and $\lambda' = 2$ spin-less Calogero models [27, 19] as it will be shown in the next section.

5.4. The freezing limit

If we take the $\lambda \to \infty$ limit in the spin-Calogero model (1), the charge dynamics freezes (the particles become pinned to a lattice) and only the spin dynamics survives. This *freezing limit* was shown by Polychronakos [28] to be equivalent to the Haldane-Shastry model (HSM) [27, 29]:

$$H_{\rm HSM} = 2\frac{\pi^2}{N^2}\sum_{j<l}\frac{S_j\cdot S_l}{\sin^2\frac{\pi}{N}(j-l)}\ , \tag{46}$$

an integrable Heisenberg chain with long range interaction. In [19] the freezing limit was studied through a systematic expansion of the hydrodynamic fields in inverse powers of $\mu \equiv \lambda + 1/2$:

$$\Omega = \Omega^{(0)} + \frac{1}{\mu}\Omega^{(1)} + \frac{1}{\mu^2}\Omega^{(2)} + \dots\ , \qquad\qquad \rho_c, v_c, \rho_s, v_s \to \Omega\ . \tag{47}$$

With an additional rescaling of time $t \to \mu t$, the equations of motion were separated order by order in powers of μ.

It was shown that the charge sector is frozen, in that charge dynamics appears only at orders $\mathrm{O}(\mu^{-1})$ and higher, while the spin sector already has non-trivial dynamics at order $\mathrm{O}(1)$. This dynamics is the same as the one derived independently for the HSM, over a background density of particles $\rho_{0c} = N/L$. As a consequence of charge freezing, this background density is kept fixed and constant up to order $\mathrm{O}(1)$ and fluctuation are suppressed as $1/\mu$. Therefore, as $\mu = \lambda + 1/2 \to \infty$, charge conservation is imposed dynamically everywhere, including in the region of depletion:

$$\tilde\rho_c^{(0)} = \tilde\rho_1^{(0)} + \tilde\rho_2^{(0)} = \rho_{01} + \rho_{02} = \rho_{0c}\ . \tag{48}$$

The above (48) along with the usual depletion boundary conditions (32) reduces (36) to

$$\begin{aligned} P_{DFP}^{\mu\to\infty}(R) &= \exp\left\{-\frac{\pi^2}{2}\left[\frac{1}{2}\left(\rho_{0s}-\tilde\rho_s^{(0)}\right)^2 + \frac{1}{\mu}\tilde\rho_c^{(1)} + \mathrm{O}(\mu^{-2})\right]R^2\right\} \qquad (49)\\ &\simeq \exp\left\{-\left[\pi\left(\rho_{01}-\tilde\rho_1^{(0)}\right)R\right]^2\right\} = \exp\left\{-\left[\pi\left(\rho_{02}-\tilde\rho_2^{(0)}\right)R\right]^2\right\}\ , \end{aligned}$$

where corrections for a finite λ are of the order $1/\mu$. Eq. (49) coincides with (45), where condition (48) was imposed as a boundary condition, and not dynamically from the equations of motion.

5.5. Haldane-Shastry model

The hydrodynamic description of the HSM (46) was constructed in [19], resulting in the following Hamiltonian for the minority spins (remember that the HSM is a lattice model and therefore there is no charge dynamics)

$$H_{\rm HSM} = \int \mathrm{d}x\left[\frac{1}{2}\,\rho_2\,v_2^2 + \frac{2}{3}\,\pi^2\,\rho_2^3\right]\ , \tag{50}$$

which is the hydrodynamic Hamiltonian for a spin-less Calogero system with coupling constant $\lambda' = 2$, see (13). It is in fact known that the spectrum of the HSM is equivalent to that of a spin-less Calogero-Sutherland model with exclusion parameter $\lambda' = 2$, but with a high degeneracy due to the underlying Yangian symmetry [27].

The connection between the HSM (50) and the sCM in the freezing limit is to express the minority spin fields in (50) in terms of spin fields [19]:

$$\rho_2 = \frac{\rho_{0c} - \rho_s}{2} \,, \qquad\qquad v_2 = -2v_s \,. \tag{51}$$

It is straightforward, using (42) with $\lambda' = 2$, to see that the PFPFS for the HSM model is exactly (49):

$$P^{HSM}_{PFPFS}(R) = \exp\Big\{ - \left[\pi \left(\rho_{02} - \tilde{\rho}_2\right) R\right]^2 \Big\} \,. \tag{52}$$

The equivalence between (45), (49) and (52) is a strong check of the consistency of our methods and shows from a novel perspective the well-known relations between the sCM in the large λ limit, the HSM and the spin-less Calogero-Sutherland model with $\lambda' = 2$.

6. Spin Depletion Probability

So far, we considered a DFP problem specified by the boundary conditions (32), i.e. by fixing the density of both species of particles on the segment $\tau = 0$, $-R < x < R$. However, our formalism allows for a more general and natural question. We can, for instance, demand a given magnetization (i.e. spin density) on the segment, without constraining the charge sector, i.e. imposing the boundary condition:

$$\rho_s(\tau = 0; -R < x < R) = \tilde{\rho}_s \,, \tag{53}$$

instead of (32).

From (34) we have

$$\rho_s = \frac{1}{\pi(\lambda+1)} \mathrm{Re}\left[k_{R1} - k_{R2}\right] \,, \tag{54}$$

substituting in (27,28,29) we find that (53) is satisfied if

$$\lambda_a \eta_a - \lambda_b \eta_b = \lambda_a \rho_{0a} - \lambda_b \rho_{0b} - (\lambda+1)\tilde{\rho}_s \,. \tag{55}$$

This equation leaves undetermined a complex constant $\xi = \xi_1 + \mathrm{i}\xi_2$: for later convenience we parametrize the solution as

$$\lambda_a \eta_a \quad = \quad \lambda_a \rho_{0a} - \frac{1}{2}\tilde{\rho}_s - \left(\lambda + \frac{1}{2}\right)\xi$$

$$
\begin{aligned}
&= \left(\lambda+\frac{1}{2}\right)(\rho_{0c}-\xi)+\frac{1}{2}(\rho_{0s}-\tilde{\rho}_s)\ , \\
\lambda_b\eta_b &= \lambda_b\rho_{0b}+\left(\lambda+\frac{1}{2}\right)(\tilde{\rho}_s-\xi) \\
&= \left(\lambda+\frac{1}{2}\right)(\rho_{0c}-\xi-\rho_{0s}+\tilde{\rho}_s)\ . \qquad (56)
\end{aligned}
$$

We have constructed the solution that realizes a constant spin density in the depletion region, while leaving the densities for the individual species free to vary. Please note that a finite imaginary part of ξ is necessary to have $\partial_x\rho_{1,2}(\tau=0;-R<x<R)\neq 0$.

We can now substitute (56) in (31) to find:

$$
P_{SDP}(R;\xi)=\exp\left\{-\frac{\pi^2}{2}\left[\left(\lambda+\frac{1}{2}\right)\left[(\rho_{0c}-\xi_1)^2+\xi_2^2\right]+\frac{1}{2}(\rho_{0s}-\tilde{\rho}_s)^2\right]R^2\right\}. \qquad (57)
$$

This probability depends on two, yet undetermined, parameters: $\xi_{1,2}$. If we choose $\xi_1=\tilde{\rho}_c$ and $\xi_2=0$ we recover exactly (36), as we expected. This would correspond to forcing a given charge density at the depletion region, together with (53).

We also note that the configuration that maximizes the probability (57) is given by $\xi=\rho_{0c}$:

$$
P_{SDP}^{\mathrm{Max}}(R)=P_{SDP}(R;\xi=\rho_{0c})=\exp\left\{-\frac{\pi^2}{4}(\rho_{0s}-\tilde{\rho}_s)^2R^2\right\}. \qquad (58)
$$

One cannot help but noticing the similarity between (58) and (49) or (52).

Since the parametrization we choose in (56) allowed us to express the probability (57) as a Gaussian for $\xi_{1,2}$, we would get the same result by performing an integral over the free parameters:

$$
P_{SDP}^{\mathrm{opt}}(R)=\int_{-\infty}^{\infty}\mathrm{d}\xi_1\int_{-\infty}^{\infty}\mathrm{d}\xi_2\,P_{SDP}(R;\xi)=P_{SDP}^{\mathrm{Max}}(R). \qquad (59)
$$

where the prefactor coming from the Gaussian integration is beyond our accuracy anyway (note, however, that it does not depend on the charge density). The integration over ξ corresponds to summing over all configurations of the form (27, 28, 29).

The probability of realizing the magnetization set by (53) is given by a sum over all configurations that satisfy the given boundary conditions. To perform this sum correctly, we would need to consider all possible charge density profiles $\tilde{\rho}_c(x)$ at the depletion region and therefore consider more general solutions than (28, 29). These general solutions are of the form

$$
\begin{aligned}
F_a(z) &\equiv \pi\left[\lambda_a\rho_{0a}-\frac{1}{2}\tilde{\rho}_s\right]\frac{z}{\sqrt{z^2-R^2}}+\frac{\pi}{2}\tilde{\rho}_s+\pi\left(\lambda+\frac{1}{2}\right)\xi(z)\ , \qquad (60)\\
F_b(z) &\equiv \pi\left[\lambda_b\rho_{0b}+\left(\lambda+\frac{1}{2}\right)\tilde{\rho}_s\right]\frac{z}{\sqrt{z^2-R^2}}+\pi\left(\lambda+\frac{1}{2}\right)[-\tilde{\rho}_s+\xi(z)]\ ,
\end{aligned}
$$

where $\xi(z)$ is an analytic function such that $\mathrm{Re}\,\xi(x) = \tilde{\rho}_c(x)$ and $\xi(z \to \infty) \to 0$. The sum over all configurations satisfying (53) can be formulated as a functional integral over all functions $\xi(z)$. However, it is easy to convince oneself that the configurations that minimize the action are of the form (28, 29), with $\xi = \rho_{0c}$.

7. Charge Depletion Probability

The last problem we will address is conjugated to the one considered in the previous section, i.e. the probability of realizing a given depletion of the charge

$$\rho_c(\tau = 0; -R < x < R) = \tilde{\rho}_c \ , \tag{61}$$

without constraining the spin density. Using (34) we have

$$\rho_c = \mathrm{Re}\left[\frac{k_{R1}}{\pi\lambda_a} + \frac{k_{R2}}{\pi\lambda_b}\right] \ , \tag{62}$$

which means that (27,28,29) fulfill (61) if

$$\eta_a + \eta_b = \rho_{0a} + \rho_{0b} - \tilde{\rho}_c \ . \tag{63}$$

Once again, we are left with the freedom of introducing a complex number $\xi = \xi_1 + \mathrm{i}\xi_2$ to parametrize the solution:

$$\begin{aligned}
\eta_a &= \rho_{0a} - \frac{2\lambda+1}{2(\lambda+1)}\tilde{\rho}_c - \frac{1}{2(\lambda+1)}\xi \\
&= \frac{2\lambda+1}{2(\lambda+1)}\left(\rho_{0c} - \tilde{\rho}_c\right) + \frac{1}{2(\lambda+1)}\left(\rho_{0s} - \xi\right) \ , \\
\eta_b &= \rho_{0b} - \frac{1}{2(\lambda+1)}\tilde{\rho}_c + \frac{1}{2(\lambda+1)}\xi \\
&= \frac{1}{2(\lambda+1)}\left(\rho_{0c} - \tilde{\rho}_c - \rho_{0s} + \xi\right) \ .
\end{aligned} \tag{64}$$

Inserting this into (31) we obtain:

$$P_{CDP}(R;\xi) = \exp\left\{-\frac{\pi^2}{2}\left[\left(\lambda+\frac{1}{2}\right)\left(\rho_{0c} - \tilde{\rho}_c\right)^2 + \frac{1}{2}\left[\left(\rho_{0s} - \xi_1\right)^2 + \xi_2^2\right]\right]R^2\right\} \ . \tag{65}$$

Setting $\xi_1 = \tilde{\rho}_s$ and $\xi_2 = 0$ correctly reproduces (36), while the maximal probability is achieved for $\xi = \rho_{0s}$:

$$P^{\mathrm{Max}}_{CDP}(R) = P_{CDP}(R;\xi = \rho_{0s}) = \exp\left\{-\frac{\pi^2}{2}\left[\left(\lambda+\frac{1}{2}\right)\left(\rho_{0c} - \tilde{\rho}_c\right)^2\right]R^2\right\} \ . \tag{66}$$

As before, since (65) is Gaussian in $\xi_{1,2}$, we would obtain the same result by integrating over these variables

$$P^{\mathrm{opt}}_{CDP}(R) = \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} \mathrm{d}\xi_1 \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} \mathrm{d}\xi_2 \, P_{CDP}(R;\xi) = P^{\mathrm{Max}}_{CDP}(R) \ , \tag{67}$$

where we neglected the coefficient coming from the Gaussian integration because its beyond the accuracy of our methodology. This integration corresponds to summing over all configurations given by (28, 29). Again, we notice a striking similarity between (66, 67) and (36). We will comment in the next section on how to interpret these results.

8. Discussion of the results

Eq. (36) looks like the product of the two independent depletion probabilities for the spin and charge sector. This interpretation is supported by the results of the two previous sections, see (58) and (66), but it is quite surprising in a sense. In fact, it would indicate a sort of an effective spin-charge separation, as if the spin and charge degrees of freedom could be depleted independently. This is contrary to intuition, since spin-charge separation is realized only for low-energy excitations close to the Fermi points, while the EFP involves degrees of freedom deep within the Fermi sea (and requires a full non-linear hydrodynamic description beyond the usual bosonization approach). However, it seems that from a EFP perspective spin-charge separation survives beyond the linearization of the spectrum, at least at leading order for the sCM.

In fact, quite surprisingly, for the Calogero-type interaction (as well as for free fermions), the DFP result obtained for small depletions using a linearized hydrodynamics (conventional bosonization) can be extended up to a complete emptiness and remain quantitatively correct [17]. This is due to the fact that the gradientless hydrodynamic for this interaction is purely cubic, see (11). This fact has two important consequences: the first one is that the equations of motion can be written as Riemann-Hopf equations (25), which are trivially integrable with the implicit solution given by (26). This is important to connect the boundary conditions at infinity with those due to the DFP. The second fact is connected to the form of the parameters u and κ of the linearized theory, which in Hamiltonian formalism can be written in general as

$$H = \int \mathrm{d}x \left[\frac{u}{2\kappa} \Pi^2 + \frac{u\,\kappa}{2} \left(\nabla\phi\right)^2 \right] , \tag{68}$$

where $\Pi(x)$ and $\phi(x)$ are conjugated fields. In terms of hydrodynamic variables (20) they are

$$v(x) \equiv \Pi(x) , \qquad \rho(x) \equiv \rho_0 + \nabla\phi(x) , \tag{69}$$

where ρ_0 is the background value over which we are linearizing the theory. Note that $\kappa = \frac{1}{\pi K}$, where K is the conventional Luttinger parameter [30].

For Calogero-type models, the sound velocity u depends linearly on the density, while the interaction parameter κ does not depend on the point around which we are linearizing. In appendix B we show that the sound velocity can be rescaled out of the DFP calculation (at zero temperature) and κ is the relevant factor encoding the interaction, which determines the coefficient of the Gaussian behavior of the DFP. All these peculiarities of the Calogero interaction conspire in a way that extending the small depletion result to higher depletion is "trivial"

and, in fact, gives the correct result. Let us remark in this respect, that any non-linear theory can be seen as the integration of successive linear approximation, where the coefficients are adjusted at each point. In this light and from what we pointed out above, it is clear that the simplicity of the Calogero interaction allows a simple integration of successive linear theories for the DFP calculation and this is the reason for which the linearized result can be trivially extended from a small DFP to a complete EFP.

In appendix B we calculate the DFP in the linearized approximation (guided by [17]). The result is (105)

$$S_{DFP}^{\text{linear}} = \frac{\pi}{2}\,\kappa\,(\rho_0 - \tilde{\rho})^2\,R^2\ , \tag{70}$$

where we used $\eta = \bar{\eta} = \rho_0 - \tilde{\rho}$.

If we substitute (12) in (11) we can write the hydrodynamic Hamiltonian in terms of spin and charge fields as

$$\begin{aligned} H \;=\; & \int \mathrm{d}x \left\{ \frac{1}{2}\rho_c v_c^2 + \frac{\pi^2}{6}\left(\lambda+\frac{1}{2}\right)^2 \rho_c^3 + \rho_s v_c v_s \right. \\ & \left. + \left[\left(\lambda+\frac{1}{2}\right)\rho_c - \lambda\rho_s\right] v_s^2 + \frac{\pi^2}{4}\left(\lambda+\frac{1}{2}\right)\rho_c\rho_s^2 - \frac{\pi^2}{12}\,\lambda\,\rho_s^3 \right\}\ . \end{aligned} \tag{71}$$

By linearizing this Hamiltonian, i.e. by expanding the fields as $\rho_{c,s} = \rho_{0;c,s} + \delta\rho_{c,s}$ and looking at the coefficients in front of the quadratic part, we find the following parameters:

$$u_c(\rho_{0c}) = \pi\left(\lambda+\frac{1}{2}\right)\rho_{0c}\ , \qquad \kappa_c(\rho_{0c}) = \pi\left(\lambda+\frac{1}{2}\right)\ , \tag{72}$$

$$u_s(\rho_{0s}) = \pi\left(\lambda+\frac{1}{2}\right)\rho_{0c} - \pi\lambda\rho_{0s}\ , \qquad \kappa_s(\rho_{0s}) = \frac{\pi}{2}\ . \tag{73}$$

We see that substituting these values in (70) correctly reproduce (58, 66) and therefore (36) as well. This means that not only the linearized theory is sufficient to calculate the correct coefficients of the EFP, but also that the spin-charge separation survives as if the linear theory was valid for high depletions as well.

To conclude, we can suggest a simple physical interpretation of (70). In a Calogero-Sutherland system, the interaction parameter $\kappa = \pi\lambda'$ has a simple semiclassical interpretation in terms of the phase-space area occupied by a single particle, see [31] and [19]. We can then see that (70) represent a volume in the $x - \tau - k$ space: the phase-space area at a given τ is of the order of $\kappa(\rho_0 - \tilde{\rho})R$, see, for instance, (24). This has to be multiplied by the number of particles involved in the depletion over time, which is of the order $(\rho_0 - \tilde{\rho})R$.

9. Conclusions

We calculated the Emptiness and Depletion Formation Probability for the spin Calogero-Model (1) and for the Haldane-Shastry Model (46). The EFP

is one of the fundamental correlators in the theory of integrable models and, despite its being non-local, is considered to be one of the simplest. Nonetheless its asymptotic behavior is known only for a few systems and in this paper we calculated it for the sCM and the HSM for the first time, at the leading order.

The DFP is a natural generalization of the EFP in the hydrodynamics formalism we employ. By calculating the DFP in its most generality (36), we can achieve the different EFPs by taking its appropriate limit. The calculation is done in an instanton picture, where the DFP is viewed as the probability of formation of a rare fluctuation in imaginary time that realizes the required depletion at a given moment.

The long distance asymptotics in 1-D models are normally calculated in a field theory approach using bosonization. However, as this approach is valid only for low-energy excitations close to the Fermi points where the linearization of the spectrum is a reasonable approximation, it is not sufficient for the EFP, which involves degrees of freedom deep in the Fermi sea. For this reason we used a non-linear version of bosonization, i.e. the hydrodynamic description developed in [19].

All our formulae show a characteristic Gaussian behavior as a function of the depletion radius R. This is to be expected for a gapless one-dimensional system, as it was first argued in [18]. This is because in the asymptotic limit we consider, R is the biggest length scale in the system and therefore the instanton configuration will have a characteristic area of R^2, where the second power comes from the dimensionality of the space-time. In [18, 17] it was also shown that for small depletion, the linearized bosonization approach is sufficient to calculate the DFP, while in general it deviates from the correct results for progressively bigger depletion and, eventually, emptiness.

However, the Calogero-Sutherland kind of models (as well as non-interacting fermions) are special and the linearized result happen to coincide with the correct, non-linear one. We argued on the origin of this observation in the previous section. Moreover, we noticed that (36) and the analysis of section 6 and 7 indicates that, from a EFP perspective, spin-charge separation seems to survive beyond the linear approximation, in disagreement with what one naïvely would expect. This resurgence of linear results in a non-linear problem is a very surprising result, peculiar of the sCM.

The coefficients in front of R^2 are novel of this work. In section 8 we interpreted them from a bosonization point of view and via a simple semiclassical argument and throughout the paper we have checked them against known results in certain limits where possible. In particular, we showed agreement with the free fermionic limit (40) and the spin-less Calogero-Sutherland model (42). For both of these models, the EFP has a particular interest coming from Random Matrix Theory, as it is known that for certain rational values of the coupling parameter λ the CSM describes the RMT ensembles. It would be interesting if the sCM would also have an interpretation in terms of some generalized random matrix model, but we are not aware of such connection yet.

In section 5.4 we used the fact that the Haldane-Shastry model can be achieved as the freezing limit ($\lambda \to \infty$) of the sCM to calculate the Probability of

Formation of (Partially) Ferromagnetic Strings in the HSM. In section 5.5, the same quantity was derived independently from the hydrodynamic description of the HSM. Section 5.4 and 5.5 highlight the correspondence between large-λ sCM, HSM and $\lambda' = \lambda + 1 = 2$ spin-less Calogero model from a EFP/DFP perspective.

Acknowledgments

We are grateful to A.G. Abanov for suggesting us to consider the EFP problem for the sCM, for his notes on the spin-less problem and for several very useful discussions during this work. F.F. would like to thank A. Scardicchio for some interesting discussions. M.K. thanks H. Katsura who motivated us in employing our hydrodynamic approach towards the calculation of correlation functions. M.K. would like to acknowledge the hospitality of The Abdus Salam International Centre for Theoretical Physics, Trieste, Italy during the workshop on *Nonequilibrium Physics from Classical to Quantum Low Dimensional Systems* where some interesting discussions took place. The work of M.K. was supported by the NSF under Grant No. DMR-0348358. F.F. acknowledges the PRIN 2007JHLPEZI.

A. Action for the DFP solution

In this appendix, we will revise the calculation presented in [17] and adapt it to our case. We want to find the value of the hydrodynamic action calculated on a given solution satisfying the DFP boundary conditions.

The gradientless hydrodynamic action in imaginary time $\tau \equiv it$ can, in general, be written as

$$\mathcal{S} = \int \mathrm{d}^2x \, \mathcal{L}[v,\rho] = \int \mathrm{d}x \, \mathrm{d}\tau \, \rho \left\{ \frac{v^2}{2} + \epsilon(\rho) - \mu \right\} , \tag{74}$$

where

$$\epsilon(\rho) = \frac{\lambda^2 \pi^2}{6} \rho^2 \tag{75}$$

is the internal energy per particle of a Calogero system and

$$\mu \equiv \partial_\rho \left[\rho \epsilon(\rho) \right]_{\rho=\rho_0} = \frac{\lambda^2 \pi^2}{2} \rho_0^2 \tag{76}$$

is the chemical potential. The action (74) has to be supplemented with the continuity equation

$$\partial_\tau \rho + \partial_x \left(\rho v \right) = 0 , \tag{77}$$

which can be considered as a constraint relating the two conjugated fields ρ and v. This constraint can be resolved by introducing the displacement field $\phi(x,\tau)$:

$$\rho = \rho_0 + \partial_x \phi , \qquad\qquad j = \rho v = -\partial_\tau \phi . \tag{78}$$

Physically, the displacement field counts the number of particles to the left of a point. We can use (78) to write the Lagrangian as a functional of ϕ: $\mathcal{L}[\rho, v] = \mathcal{L}[\phi]$. Its variation then gives the Euler equation for the fluid, which can be written more simply as

$$\partial_\tau v + v\partial_x v = \partial_x \partial_\rho \left[\rho\epsilon(\rho)\right] = \lambda^2\pi^2\rho\partial_x\rho \; . \tag{79}$$

For the particular choice of internal energy (75), corresponding to the Calogero-Sutherland interaction or exclusion statistics, the Euler equation and the continuity equation can be combined into a single complex Riemann-Hopf equation:

$$\partial_\tau k - \mathrm{i}k\partial_x k = 0 \; , \qquad\qquad k(\tau, x) \equiv \lambda\pi\rho(\tau, x) + \mathrm{i}v(\tau, x) \; . \tag{80}$$

This equation has a simple, implicit, solution of the form

$$k = F(x + \mathrm{i}k\tau) \; . \tag{81}$$

In the body of the paper, we argued that a solution satisfying the DFP boundary conditions is of the form

$$F(z) \equiv F(z; \rho_0, \eta) = \lambda\pi\rho_0 + \lambda\pi\eta\left(\frac{z}{\sqrt{z^2 - R^2}} - 1\right) \; . \tag{82}$$

Here, ρ_0 is the background (equilibrium) density at infinity (where moreover $v = 0$), and η is a, possibly complex, constant specifying the DFP.

To calculate the Depletion Formation Probability, we need to compare the action (74) calculated on the solution (81,82) to the action of an equilibrium configuration:

$$\mathcal{S} - \mathcal{S}_0 = \int \mathrm{d}x\, \mathrm{d}\tau \left\{\rho\frac{v^2}{2} + \rho\epsilon(\rho) - \rho_0\epsilon(\rho_0) - \mu(\rho - \rho_0)\right\} \; . \tag{83}$$

To take advantage of the fact that (81) is a solution of the equations of motion, we first take the variation of (83) with respect to the parameters of the solution. In this way, we will reduce a two-dimensional integration to a contour integral over the boundaries, since the bulk terms are proportional to the Euler-Lagrange equations and vanish:

$$\mathrm{d}\left(\mathcal{S} - \mathcal{S}_0\right) = \partial_{\rho_0}\left(\mathcal{S} - \mathcal{S}_0\right)\, \mathrm{d}\rho_0 + \partial_\eta\left(\mathcal{S} - \mathcal{S}_0\right)\, \mathrm{d}\eta + \partial_{\bar\eta}\left(\mathcal{S} - \mathcal{S}_0\right)\, \mathrm{d}\bar\eta \; . \tag{84}$$

We have:

$$\begin{aligned}
\partial_\eta\left(\mathcal{S} - \mathcal{S}_0\right) &= \int \mathrm{d}^2x \left\{-v\partial_\tau\phi_\eta - \left[\frac{v^2}{2} - \partial_\rho\left(\rho\epsilon\right) + \mu\right]\partial_x\phi_\eta\right\} \\
&= \int \mathrm{d}^2x \left\{-\partial_\tau\left[v\,\phi_\eta\right] - \partial_x\left[\left(\frac{v^2}{2} - \partial_\rho\left(\rho\epsilon\right) + \mu\right)\phi_\eta\right]\right. \\
&\qquad\qquad \left. + \left[\partial_\tau v + v\partial_x v - \partial_x\partial_\rho\left(\rho\epsilon\right)\right]\phi_\eta\right\} \\
&= -\oint \left\{\left[v\,\phi_\eta\right]\mathrm{d}x + \left[\left(\frac{v^2}{2} - \partial_\rho\left(\rho\epsilon\right) + \mu\right)\phi_\eta\right]\mathrm{d}t\right\} \; ,
\end{aligned} \tag{85}$$

where $\phi_\eta \equiv \partial_\eta \phi$.

The boundaries over which the contour integral is taken are, by Stoke's theorem, the points where the integrand has a discontinuity. It is easy to check that this contour comprises only two paths: one at infinity ($C_0 \equiv \{|x + \mathrm{i}k\tau| = \infty\}$) and one around the branch cut of (82), which we take along the real axis ($C_1 = \{\tau = 0^\pm, -R < x < R\}$).

From (81,82), at infinity we have

$$\rho(|z_0| \to \infty) \simeq \rho_0 + \frac{R^2}{4}\left(\frac{\eta}{z_0^2} + \frac{\bar\eta}{\bar z_0^2}\right) + \dots , \tag{86}$$

$$v(|z_0| \to \infty) \simeq -\mathrm{i}\lambda\pi\frac{R^2}{4}\left(\frac{\eta}{z_0^2} - \frac{\bar\eta}{\bar z_0^2}\right) + \dots , \tag{87}$$

$$\phi(|z_0| \to \infty) \simeq -\frac{R^2}{4}\left(\frac{\eta}{z_0} + \frac{\bar\eta}{\bar z_0}\right) + \dots , \tag{88}$$

and we see that the integrand in (85) along C_0 vanishes too fast and the contour integral gives no contribution.

Close to the cut on the real axis we have

$$\rho(\tau = 0^\pm; -R < x < R) = \rho_0 - \frac{\eta + \bar\eta}{2} \mp \mathrm{i}\frac{\eta - \bar\eta}{2}\frac{x}{\sqrt{R^2 - x^2}} , \tag{89}$$

$$v(\tau = 0^\pm; -R < x < R) = \mathrm{i}\lambda\pi\frac{\eta - \bar\eta}{2} \mp \lambda\pi\frac{\eta + \bar\eta}{2}\frac{x}{\sqrt{R^2 - x^2}} , \tag{90}$$

$$\phi(\tau = 0^\pm; -R < x < R) = -\frac{\eta + \bar\eta}{2}x \pm \mathrm{i}\frac{\eta - \bar\eta}{2}\sqrt{R^2 - x^2} . \tag{91}$$

Therefore

$$\begin{aligned}\partial_\eta\left(\mathcal{S} - \mathcal{S}_0\right) &= \int_{-R}^{R}\left[v(x,0^+)\phi_\eta(x,0^+) - v(x,0^-)\phi_\eta(x,0^-)\right]\mathrm{d}x \\ &= \frac{\lambda\pi^2 R^2}{2}\bar\eta .\end{aligned} \tag{92}$$

Similarly, we have

$$\begin{aligned}\partial_{\bar\eta}\left(\mathcal{S} - \mathcal{S}_0\right) &= -\oint\left\{\left[v\,\phi_{\bar\eta}\right]\mathrm{d}x + \left[\left(\frac{v^2}{2} - \partial_\rho\left(\rho\epsilon\right) + \mu\right)\phi_{\bar\eta}\right]\mathrm{d}t\right\} \\ &= \frac{\lambda\pi^2 R^2}{2}\eta .\end{aligned} \tag{93}$$

The derivative with respect to ρ_0 is a bit more complicated as it involves more terms. After a bit of algebra and an additional integration by parts we obtain:

$$\begin{aligned}\partial_{\rho_0}\left(\mathcal{S} - \mathcal{S}_0\right) = -\oint\Big\{&\Big[v\left(\phi_{\rho_0} - x\right)\Big]\mathrm{d}x \\ &+ \left[\left(\frac{v^2}{2} - \partial_\rho\left(\rho\epsilon\right) + \mu\right)\left(\phi_{\rho_0} + x\right) + \left(\partial_{\rho_0}\mu\right)\phi\right]\mathrm{d}t\Big\}\end{aligned} \tag{94}$$

where $\phi_{\rho_0} \equiv \partial_{\rho_0}\phi$. Substituting the behaviors (86-88) and (89-91), the integrals around the two contours gives equal but opposite results ($\pm\frac{1}{2}\lambda\pi^2(\eta+\bar{\eta})R^2$), which means

$$\partial_{\rho_0}\left(\mathcal{S}-\mathcal{S}_0\right)=0\ , \tag{95}$$

as one could have expected.

We can now integrate (84) using (92,93,95) to find

$$\mathcal{S}_{\rm DFP}=\mathcal{S}-\mathcal{S}_0=\frac{1}{2}\,\lambda\,\pi^2\,\eta\,\bar{\eta}\,R^2\ . \tag{96}$$

B. Linearized Hydrodynamics and DFP

Let us linearize the hydrodynamic equations, by expanding the theory and retaining only the quadratic part of the Lagrangian. This *linearized hydrodynamics* is usually referred in the literature on one-dimensional models as *bosonization*.

From the previous section, we have that the gradientless hydrodynamic Lagrangian for a one-component system is

$$\mathcal{L}[j,\rho]=\frac{j^2}{2\rho}+\rho\Big[\epsilon(\rho)-\mu\Big]\ , \tag{97}$$

where $j=\rho v$. We expand the fields around a background value and we parametrize the fluctuations around this background through the *displacement field* ϕ as in (78), so that the constraint (77) is automatically satisfied. Keeping terms up to the quadratic order we have

$$\begin{aligned}\mathcal{L}[\phi] &= \frac{1}{2\rho_0}\left(\partial_\tau\phi\right)^2+\frac{1}{2}\partial_\rho^2\left(\rho\epsilon\right)_{\rho=\rho_0}\left(\partial_x\phi\right)^2+\rho_0\Big[\epsilon(\rho_0)-\mu\Big]\ldots\\ &= \frac{\kappa}{2u}\left(\partial_\tau\phi\right)^2+\frac{\kappa\,u}{2}\left(\partial_x\phi\right)^2+\mathcal{L}[0,\rho_0]+\ldots\ ,\end{aligned} \tag{98}$$

where in the last line we introduce the standard parameters of bosonization: the interaction parameter $\kappa=\kappa(\rho_0)$ and the sound velocity $u=u(\rho_0)$. The displacement field evolves according to a linear wave equation:

$$\partial_\tau^2\phi+u^2\partial_x^2\phi=0\ . \tag{99}$$

The linearized treatment is valid for small fluctuations around the background ρ_0, i.e. as long as the gradients of ϕ are small and only low energy excitations are involved. For this reason, it is not possible to calculate the EFP through standard bosonization, but we can consider a DFP with very small depletion.

It is simple to see [17] that the solution that satisfies the DFP boundary conditions is of the form:

$$\phi(\tau,x)=\mathrm{Re}\left[\eta\left(\sqrt{z_0^2-R^2}-z_0\right)\right]\ , \tag{100}$$

where $z_0 \equiv x + \mathrm{i}u(\rho_0)\tau$. For this solution to be compatible with the linearized approximation we need $|\eta|/\rho_0 \ll 1$.

It is easy to calculate the DFP by evaluating the linearized action

$$\mathcal{S} - \mathcal{S}_0 \simeq \int \mathrm{d}x\mathrm{d}\tau \left\{ \frac{\kappa}{2u} \left(\partial_\tau \phi\right)^2 + \frac{\kappa\, u}{2} \left(\partial_x \phi\right)^2 \right\} \tag{101}$$

on the solution (100). One immediately observes that, at zero temperature, this action does not depend on the sound velocity, as we can rescale the time as $y \equiv u\tau$:

$$\mathcal{S} - \mathcal{S}_0 \simeq \frac{\kappa}{2} \int \mathrm{d}x\mathrm{d}y \left\{ \left(\partial_y \phi\right)^2 + \left(\partial_x \phi\right)^2 \right\} \ . \tag{102}$$

We can further rescale the lengths by R and substituting (100) in (102) we get

$$\mathcal{S} - \mathcal{S}_0 \simeq \frac{\kappa}{2}\, \eta\bar{\eta} R^2 \int \mathrm{d}\tilde{x}\mathrm{d}\tilde{y} \left| \tilde{\phi}'(\tilde{x} + \mathrm{i}\tilde{y}) \right|^2 \ , \tag{103}$$

where

$$\tilde{\phi}(z) = \sqrt{z^2 - 1} - z \ . \tag{104}$$

Now all the physical parameters have been explicitly extracted and one has just to perform an integral that contributes only with a numerical factor. The result is

$$\mathcal{S} - \mathcal{S}_0 \simeq \frac{\pi}{2}\, \kappa\, \eta\, \bar{\eta} R^2 \ . \tag{105}$$

Since for a Calogero-Sutherland system $\kappa = \lambda\pi$, we notice that (105) exactly coincide with (96). This is quite surprising, since, as we argued above, the linearized result should be trusted to be approximately correct only for small depletions. However, the Calogero kind of interaction is very special and we can extend (105) to higher depletion, without loosing accuracy. In section 8 we discuss the meaning of this observation. Let us remark that this result is specific for the EFP and it is not to say that for Calogero-Sutherland systems the effects of non-linearity are in general not important. For instance, effects of non-linear spin-charge interactions were observed and discussed in [19].

This DFP calculation can also be performed using the line integral technique explained in the previous section. In this case, the variation of the action (101) gives simply:

$$\begin{aligned} \partial_\eta \left(\mathcal{S} - \mathcal{S}_0\right) &\simeq \oint \left\{ \frac{\kappa}{u} \left(\partial_\tau \phi\right) \phi_\eta \, \mathrm{d}x + \kappa\, u \left(\partial_x \phi\right) \phi_\eta \, \mathrm{d}\tau \right\} \\ &= \kappa \oint \left\{ \left(\partial_y \phi\right) \phi_\eta \, \mathrm{d}x + \left(\partial_x \phi\right) \phi_\eta \, \mathrm{d}y \right\} . \end{aligned} \tag{106}$$

One can then proceed as we showed in the previous section to easily recover (105).

References

[1] V.E. Korepin, N.M. Bogoliubov, and A.G. Izergin, *Quantum Inverse Scattering Mehod and Correlation Functions*, Cambridge University Press (1993).

[2] M. Shiroishi, M. Takahashi, and Y. Nishiyama, J. Phys. Soc. Jap. **70**, 3535 (2001).
Emptiness Formation Probability for the One-Dimensional Isotropic XY Model.

[3] A.G. Abanov, and F. Franchini, Phys. Lett. **A 316**, 342 (2003).
Emptiness formation probability for the anisotropic XY spin chain in a magnetic field.

[4] F. Franchini, and A. G. Abanov, J. Phys. A: Math. Gen. **38**, 5069 (2005).
Emptiness Formation Probability for the Anisotropic XY model in a Magnetic Field.

[5] F. Franchini, Ph.D. thesis, Stony Brook University, 2006, preprint arXiv/0801.2734.
On Hydrodynamic Correlations in Low-Dimensional Interacting Systems

[6] N. Kitanine, J.M. Maillet, N.A. Slavnov, and V. Terras, J. Phys. A: Math. Gen. **35**, L753 (2002).
Large distance asymptotic behaviour of the emptiness formation probability of the XXZ spin-$\frac{1}{2}$ Heisenberg chain.

[7] V.E. Korepin, S. Lukyanov, Y. Nishiyama and M. Shiroishi, Phys. Lett. **A 312**, 21 (2003).
Asymptotic Behavior of the Emptiness Formation Probability in the Critical Phase of XXZ Spin Chain.

[8] K.K. Kozlowski, J. Stat. Mech. **0802**, P02006 (2008).
On the emptiness formation probability of the open XXZ spin-$\frac{1}{2}$ chain.

[9] F. Colomo, and A.G. Pronko, Cont. Math. **458**, 361 (2008).
The Arctic Circle Revisited.

[10] F. Colomo, and A.G. Pronko, Nuc. Phys. **B 798**, 340 (2008).
Emptiness formation probability in the domain-wall six-vertex model.

[11] F. Colomo, and A.G. Pronko, arXiv:0803.2697 (2008).
The limit shape of large alternating sign matrices.

[12] T. Deguchi, and C. Matsui, arXiv:0907.0582 (2009).
Emptiness formation probability of the integrable higher-spin XXX and XXZ spin chains through the fusion method.

[13] J. Stolze, and T. Garske, arXiv:0904.3519 (2009).
The emptiness formation probability correlation in homogeneous and dimerized XX chains.

[14] Z. Tsuboi, and M. Shiroishi, J. Phys. A: Math. Gen. **38**, 363 (2005).
High temperature expansion of the emptiness formation probability for the isotropic Heisenberg chain

[15] Z. Tsuboi, Physica **A 377**, 95 (2007).
A note on the high temperature expansion of the density matrix for the isotropic Heisenberg chain

[16] F. Gohmann, A. Klumper, and A. Seel, Physica B, **359-361**, 807 (2005).
Emptiness formation probability at finite temperature for the isotropic Heisenberg chain

[17] A.G. Abanov, in Application of random matrices in physics, E. Brezin, V. Kazakov, D. Serban, P. Wiegmann, and A. Zabrodin (Eds.) NATO Science Series II: Mathematics, Physics and Chemistry, Vol. 221 Springer (2005), available also as arXiv:cond-mat/0504307.
Hydrodynamics of correlated systems and spacing distribution in Random Matrices.

[18] A.G. Abanov, and V.E. Korepin, Nucl. Phys. **B 647**, 565 (2002).
On the probability of ferromagnetic strings in antiferromagnetic spin chains.

[19] M. Kulkarni, F. Franchini, and A.G. Abanov, Physical Review B **80**, 165105 (2009), also at arXiv:cond-mat/0904.3762.
Nonlinear dynamics of spin and charge in spin-Calogero model

[20] A.P. Polychronakos, Phys. Rev. Lett. **69**, 703 (1992).
Exchange operator formalism for integrable systems of particles.

[21] Z.N.C. Ha, and F.D.M. Haldane, Phys. Rev. **B 46**, 9359 (1992).
Models with inverse-square exchange.

[22] K. Hikami, and M. Wadati, Phys. Lett. **A 173**, 263-266 (1993).
Integrable spin-1/2 particle systems with long-range interactions.

[23] For a review and original references see
B. Sutherland, *Beautiful Models. 10 Years of Exactly Solved Quantum Many-Body Problems.*, World Scientific, Singapore (2004).

[24] M.L. Mehta, Random Matrices, 2nd rev. enl. ed. New York: Academic Press (1991).

[25] J.P. Keating, F. Mezzadri, and M. Novaes, J. Phys. **A 39**, L389 (2006).
A new correlator in quantum spin chains.

[26] J. des Cloizeaux, and M.L. Mehta, J. Math. Phys. **14**, 1648 (1973).
Asymptotic Behavior of Spacing Distributions for Eigenvalues of Random Matrices.
F. Dyson, Commun. Math. Phys. **47**, 171 (1976).
Fredholm Determinants and Inverse Scattering Problems.

[27] F.D.M Haldane, Phys. Rev. Lett. **60**, 635 (1988).
Exact Jastrow-Gutzwiller resonating-valence-bond ground state of the spin-1/2 antiferromagnetic Heisenberg chain with $1/r^2$ *exchange.*

[28] A.P. Polychronakos, Phys. Rev. Lett. **70**, 2329 (1993).
Lattice integrable systems of Haldane-Shastry type.

[29] B.S. Shastry, Phys. Rev. Lett. **60**, 639 (1988).
Exact solution of an S=1/2 Heisenberg antiferromagnetic chain with long-ranged interactions.

[30] T. Giamarchi, *"Quantum Physics in One Dimension"*; Oxford University Press (2004).

[31] Y. Kato, T. Yamamoto, and M. Arikawa, J. Phys. Soc. Jpn. **66**, 1954 (1997).
Elementary excitations and dynamical correlation functions of the Calogero-Sutherland model with internal symmetry.